

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 11, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-13 are rejected to by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 10 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-13 remain pending in this application.

In Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In view of claims as presently amended, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,403,616 to Hattori et al. (hereinafter "Hattori"). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori in combination with Applicant's admitted state of the art.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hattori is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, "wherein the master is separately formed from the substrate so that the master is separable from the substrate." Hattori does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Hattori merely discloses "According to the present invention, as described above, printing is performed at the conducting film unnecessary portion on the substrate with a masking ink, after drying, the ink is cured by heat preferably at 50.degree. to 200.degree. C. more preferably 100.degree. to 150.degree. C., for 4 to 60 minutes, or light to improve solvent resistance of the masking pattern." See lines 46-52 in Column 3. That is, in Hattori, the mask ink is directly printed to form the mask pattern, not separately formed from the substrate. Thus, Hattori does not teach at least "master is separately formed from the substrate" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2-4 and 6-9, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2-4 and 6-9 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1, which is allowable.

Claim 10 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, “wherein the master is separately formed from the substrate so that the master is separable from the substrate.” In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 10 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 10, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable over Hattori for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 11, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claim 11 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 10, which is allowable.

Claim 12 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, “wherein the master is separately formed from the substrate so that the master is separable from the substrate.” In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 12 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 12, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable over Hattori for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 13, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claim 13 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 12, which is allowable.

The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori in combination with Applicant’s admitted stage of the art is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 5 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 12, which is allowable.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: **11 January 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. **40,106**
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP
1900 K St. NW
Washington, DC 20006
202.496.7500
Attorneys for Applicant